

Recommend Final Set of Alternatives

April 2011





Purpose and Need

Corridor Study Area described by the following:

- Densely-developed, most active hearts of Los Angeles and Orange counties
- Population density is 3x Orange County and 1.5x Los Angeles County urbanized averages
- Population growth = +500,000 people (FY2035)
- Employment growth = 44% of Orange County jobs and 29% of Los Angeles County jobs



Mobility Problem

Corridor's Mobility Problem described in terms of:

- Transit system constraints lacks system connections both within and beyond the Corridor
- Freeway and arterial congestion today and in future, majority of Corridor's highway system operates at or beyond capacity during both peak travel periods
- Limited travel options 92 to 96 percent of work trips are currently made by automobile, and will be in the future



Study Goals

Stakeholders/public told us:

- Make it a desirable solution for us to use
- Provide new travel option that connects to regional transit system
- Increase access to our destinations/activity centers
- Serve both community and regional trips
- Provide fast travel speed
- Select cost-effective solution
- Support local economic development/revitalization opportunities
- Minimize environmental impacts on adjacent communities



Initial Screening Criteria

Initial Set of Alternatives evaluated based on:

- Public and Stakeholder Input/Support
- Mobility Improvements including ridership and travel speed
- Support for development/revitalization plans
- Environmental Impacts
- Engineering and Operating Viability
- Cost/Conceptual Cost Per Rider



Initial Set of Alternatives

Alternatives studied during Initial Screening:

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Street Car
- Light Rail Transit (LRT)
- Multiple Unit/Sprinter
- Conventional High Speed Rail
- Maglev High Speed Service



Spacing

Bus Rapid Transit Alternative



Trips Serves regional and local trips

Speed Street-running (10-14 mph) HOV (25-35 mph)

Station 0.5-1.0 mile between stations

Land Use Support for development/revitalization plans proven internationally (Canada, Australia)







Urban Rail Alternatives



Trips

Serves regional and local trips

Speed

Provides a low to medium speed: 8.5 - 15 mph (Streetcar); 25-35 mph (LRT); 25-55

mph (DMU)

Station Spacing 0.2-0.5 miles between stops (Streetcar) 1.0-1.5 miles (LRT); 1.5-3.0 miles (DMU)

Land Use Plans

Demonstrated support for development/revitalization plans









High Speed Service Alternatives



Trips

Serves regional trips

Speed

Provides high speed of 110-220 mph

Station Spacing 10-20 miles between stations

Land Use Plans Demonstrated support for high density development nationally (Conventional) and internationally (Conventional & Maglev)







Final Set of Alternatives

Recommended Final Set of Alternatives for further study will include:

- ✓ No Build Alternative
- ✓ Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative
- √ 2-3 Build Alternatives





Initial Screening Summary

			BRT	Street Car	LRT	DMU	Conv. (HSS)	Maglev (HSS)
Serves:	Local trips Regional trips		√ TBD	√ TBD	√ √	√ √	√	√
Speed	At-grade Grade-separated ROW		10-14 25-35	8.5-15 25-40	25-35 45-55	25-35 45-55	 110-220+	 140-270+
Provides support for local plans			TBD	√	√	*	*	*
Requires Property Acquisition ¹			0	0	10 <u>+</u>	10 <u>+</u>	125 <u>+</u>	125 <u>+</u>
Has Air Quality Benefits			Yes	Yes	Yes	No ²	Yes	Yes
Fit with local system plans			✓	√	✓	No	No	No
Has State Federal <i>F</i>	e and	Vehicles	√	State in Process	√	√	√	Not Yet
	Approved:	System	√	√	√	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Conceptual Ridership		19,200- 32,400	26,000-39,000	26,000- 57,600	26,000 - 57,600	2,400-4,800	2,400-4,800	
Conceptual Cost to Build (At-grade- Above-grade costs, \$2010, billions)			\$0.6-2.2	\$1.3-4.0	\$1.6-4.2	\$1.2-4.1	\$4. 9 ³	\$5.9 ³
Conceptual Annual Cost Per Rider		\$20-50	\$10-40	\$10-50	\$10-50	\$460-920	\$580-1,150	

^{*}Proven nationally and/ or internationally



¹Does not include storage/maintenance yard-related acquisition; too early in process to identify

²Some regional benefits

³Above-grade cost only; does not operate at-grade



TAC Recommendation

Alternatives not recommended for further study:

Multiple Unit/Sprinter

Challenges:

- Community Support
- Air Quality
- System Fit

High Speed Service

- Conventional High Speed Rail
- Maglev High Speed Service

Challenges:

- Community Support
- Requires Major Acquisition
- System Fit
- Primarily Regional Trips
- Costs/Annual Cost per rider
- Funding Availability





TAC Recommendation

Initial Set of Alternatives recommended for further study:

- Bus Rapid Transit
- Street Car
- Light Rail Transit

With Steering Committee direction:

Low Speed Maglev